

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 3, 12-20, and 23 have been canceled. Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 21, 22 and 24-31 have been allowed. Claim 32 has been amended. Claims 1-2, 4-11, 21-22, and 24-33 are currently pending in the application. Applicant submits that this response places the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this response be entered and made of record.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tonelli et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,831,610). Claim 32 has been amended to clarify the subject matter that is being claimed.

Claim 32

Claim 32 has been amended, and as amended, now recites:

A method comprising:
 presenting a graphical display of a plurality of graphical depictions representing a plurality of nodes in a network;
 accepting a user selection of a first graphical depiction representing a first node;
in response to the user selection of the first graphical depiction, and without requiring any further user input, automatically determining a set of two or more other nodes in said network that may be connected to said first node, wherein said set of other nodes is represented by a set of other graphical depictions in said graphical display; and
 altering the appearance of each graphical depiction in said set of other graphical depictions to indicate that said set of other nodes may be connected to said first node. (Emphasis added)

The amendments to claim 32 are amply supported by the Specification (see, e.g. page 13, lines 3-9; page 13, line 17 to page 14, line 2; page 18, lines 9-17; etc.).

According to amended claim 32, in response to a user selection of a first graphical depiction representing a first node, a determination is automatically made as to which set of two or more other nodes in a network may be connected to the first node. This determination is made without requiring any further user input. The appearance of each of the graphical depictions representing the nodes in the set of other nodes is then altered to indicate that the corresponding nodes may be connected to the first node. Thus, with the method of claim 1, a user can see which other nodes may be connected to a first node by simply selecting the first node. In response, the other nodes that can be connected to the first node are indicated to the user. This is done without requiring the user to provide any further user input. Thus, as can be seen, the method of claim 32 makes it quite easy for a user to determine which nodes may be connected to the first node.

Such a method is neither disclosed nor suggested by Tonelli. Instead, Tonelli discloses a method in which a user has to provide further user input before any connection determination is made. Specifically, as discussed in Col. 9, lines 3-25 of Tonelli, a user selects an initial device (e.g. PC 116' in Fig. 11). The user then drags a connection to a target device (e.g. hub 112'). If the connection between the initial device and the target device can be accepted, then the target device turns green. If the connection cannot be accepted, then the target device turns red. Notice that with the method of Tonelli, if the user simply selects the initial device and nothing more, no connection determination is made. A connection determination is made only if the user drags a connection to the target device. Thus, with the method of Tonelli, a user has to provide additional user input after the initial device is selected. Unlike the method of claim 32, the method of Tonelli does not, in response to the user selection of the first graphical depiction, and without requiring any further user input, automatically determining a set of two or more other nodes in a network that may be

connected to the first node. There is no such teaching or suggestion in Tonelli. Thus, for least this reason, Applicant submits that claim 32, as amended, is patentable over Tonelli.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonelli in view of Blumenau et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,839,747). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 33 depends from claim 32. Thus, if it can be shown that claim 32 is patentable over Tonelli and Blumenau, then it logically follows that claim 33 is also patentable over Tonelli and Blumenau. As argued above, Tonelli fails to disclose at least one aspect of claim 32. This same aspect is also not disclosed or suggested by Blumenau. Thus, even if the references were combined (assuming for the sake of argument that it would have been obvious to combine the references), the combination still would not yield the method of claim 32. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 32 is patentable over Tonelli and Blumenau, taken individually or in combination. Applicant further submits that claim 33 is likewise patentable over Tonelli and Blumenau for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 32.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged that claims 1, 2, 4-11, 21, 22, and 24-31 are allowable. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this acknowledgement.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including any art cited but not applied.

Accordingly, allowance of all of the pending claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

To the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136.

If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: November 30, 2007

/BobbyKTruong#37499/

Bobby K. Truong

Reg. No. 37,499

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110-1089
Telephone: (408) 414-1080 ext. 234
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076